



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,373	11/14/2003	Seiji Katsuoka	2003-1659A	9589
513	7590	06/02/2008	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			LAMB, BRENDA A	
2033 K STREET N. W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/02/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/712,373	KATSUOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Brenda A. Lamb	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 14-21 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tepman et al 5,922,133 in view of Pickering et al 5,584,936.

Tepman et al teaches the design of a apparatus comprising: a substrate receiving ring assembly to which the seal ring is mounted; a vertically movable substrate holder having a substrate holder surface so as to hold by nipping or clamping a peripheral portion of the substrate between the substrate holder and seal ring so as to seal a peripheral portion of the substrate during processing of the substrate; a temporary retaining section which includes element 60 is mounted to the substrate receiving ring assembly and positioned around the seal ring to temporarily retain on or against the substrate while forming a space between the substrate and the seal ring.

Tepman et al fails to teach the pedestal includes a substrate fixing ring. However, it would have been obvious to modify the Tepman et al by using as a substrate holder surface one that includes a substrate fixing ring for the advantage taught by Pickering et al of stabilizing the position of the wafer (see column 2 line 57 to column 3 line 5). With respect to claim 10, the recitation that the substrate processing unit is a pre-plating treatment unit for carrying out a pre-plating treatment of the substrate prior to plating does not define applicant's invention over the Tepman et al since the term "pre-plating treatment" reads on a wide range of treatment including the sputtering treatment set forth at column 10 lines 49-65). With respect to claim 13, the recitation that the substrate receiving ring and substrate fixing ring hold the substrate with its front surface facing downward does not structurally further limit the apparatus over Tepman et al as modified since Tepman et al shows a surface of the substrate faces downwardly. With respect to claims 11-12, It would have been prima facie obvious that the Tepman et al sputtering unit is capable of applying a variety of materials including a cleaning agent and a catalyst agent since it is known to sputter a cleaning agent and a catalyst onto a wafer during a manufacturing process for a substrate.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Stemple 4,585,517 teaches sputter cleaning of wafer.

Zurcher et al 6,344,413 at column 7 line 65 to column 8 line 11 teaches sputtering a catalyst onto a substrate.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 14-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda A. Lamb whose telephone number is (571) 272-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Wednesdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton, can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/712,373  
Art Unit: 1792

Page 5

Brenda A Lamb  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1792

/Brenda A Lamb/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792